

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION  
NUMBER:**

For Planning Commission Agenda of:

Consent Agenda Item	Item Number:
Continued Hearing Item	Item Number:
Public Hearing Item	Item Number:
Department Report	Item Number:
Old Business	Item Number:

Re:

Record Number:

Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):

Area:

Attached for the Planning Commission's record and review is the following supplementary information:

**From:** [manny.gonzales](#)  
**To:** [Planning Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** AT&T CELL PHONE PROJECT-ARCATA, CALIFORNIA  
**Date:** Monday, June 28, 2021 4:36:07 PM

---

Hello,

I'm writing in reference to the AT&T cell phone project for the Arcata Bottoms. I'm very excited and pleased to hear about the proposal of AT&T expanding their service in the Humboldt County area. Currently, I reside in Texas and have absolutely loved our service with AT&T and have been a faithful customer with them for 25 years now! I was born and raised in Arcata and we often travel to the Humboldt County area to visit our family. Recently, I heard of the expanded service and the proposal of the AT&T design and project and wanted to advise you that I strongly support it! AT&T is ranked as one of the fastest providers in California. Unfortunately, currently there is only one cell tower in the Arcata area. Therefore, I believe additional coverage across the area with AT&T would be a huge asset and it would provide a stronger signal and a much more reliable and faster service to the area. We noticed that on our recent trips to Arcata, the cell phone service wasn't the best and improvement was obviously needed. An additional cell tower could definitely benefit the area. I strongly believe for the safety and emergencies of the residents, especially in the areas like Arcata Bottoms, a more reliable and stronger signal would benefit the community!

Thank You,  
The Manny and Tricia Gonzales

**From:** [Eric Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Planning Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed AT&T Tower in Arcata  
**Date:** Monday, June 28, 2021 4:49:49 PM

---

Hello,

I'm writing this email to express my approval for the planned AT&T Towers in the Arcata Bottoms. I approve of the design as it will bring a much needed service to the area. The coverage here in Humboldt has long been a source of dropped calls, no service for most all AT&T customers. These customers could be faced with an emergency and won't have enough signal strength to reach out.

Hopefully, this input will weigh in on the decision to move forward.

Eric Johnson  
Arcata Resident

**From:** [June Moxon](#)  
**To:** [Planning Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Att cell tower on Arcata Bottom  
**Date:** Monday, June 28, 2021 4:51:02 PM

---

As a near by resident on Arcata Bottom I feel a water tower fits in with ag land perfectly along with location. When I was a young child our Dairy had two water towers just four fields away. I feel for the proposed new walking trail with children and those of all ages needing cell reception for accidents, safety and law protection. In speaking with my neighbors on Arcata Bottom we totally agree to approve the At&t cell tower.

**From:** [Karen Davidson](#)  
**To:** [Planning Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Cell towers should follow the law at 40 feet and do CEQA report  
**Date:** Monday, June 28, 2021 4:59:18 PM  
**Attachments:** [image.png](#)  
[image.png](#)

---

Dear County Planners,

I appreciate the work you do and hope we can agree on plans for the two towers proposed. Your decisions will either fuel the next few towers as well as any wind farms and other tall structures, or preserve the bottoms for local residents. It seems as if only those expecting profit from this can agree with the proposal as it stands for the following reasons:

1. This is illegal under CEQA as proposed. Planners can't waive Aesthetic impacts and adopt a Negative Declaration. Below is the official CEQA checklist for Planners, and even a regular citizen can't miss that the first legally protected value is Aesthetics? No reasonable Planner can pretend there isn't an CEQA-protected Aesthetic impact to a 130' tower easily seen from any vantage in the Bottoms. This Agency is being sued because of their consistent decision to adopt Negative Declarations for big projects.

## Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources        | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils              | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality   | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning                | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing               | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

2. This is unfair. None of us can build a 130' tall building, even if it's really skinny. There is no other structure in the Bottoms that is 130' or 100'--the tallest buildings are historic 40' tall hay barns. There's no reason to give these people 90 extra feet of height to their construction, even if it is skinny--what's fair is 40', what we all build beneath. They should be proposing something that is consistent with existing height standards allowed for any other type of building in Ag Exclusive. Just like with the 23 acre weed grow, the proposed towers stretch to the limit of what is physically possible on a site, and stretches the legal boundaries, rather than being fair-minded, balancing the desires of the property owners to make money and the California values protected by CEQA, and the

community values expressed in our General Plan and Land Use Code, which makes the Bottoms an Agricultural Exclusive zoning that doesn't allow tall buildings. So they need to lower the towers to 40' and hide the towers to make this legal--make them look like a historic 40' water tower, for instance. This is a standard strategy for cell phone towers in protected zones--they're called Concealed or Stealth towers--see below:

**The Monopole Tower** is a single tube tower. It typically stands between 100-200 ft. with antennas mounted on the exterior of the tower. Its primary use is telephony.



**The Lattice Tower** is sometimes referred to as "self-support" or SST because it is free-standing. It stands 200-400 ft. tall with a triangular base and three-four sides. It is typically used for telephony. The Eiffel Tower is a lattice tower.



**The Guyed Tower** is basically a straight rod supported by wires that attach to the ground as support. It's cheapest to construct, especially at heights of 300 ft and beyond. Some guyed towers reach as high as 2,000 ft. Typical uses are: telephony, radio, television, and paging.



**Concealed and Stealth® Towers.**

Stealth® towers are a particular brand of concealed towers. Another manufacture of concealed towers in Larson Camouflage. Concealed towers are deployed to satisfy zoning regulations, and can range in size to accommodate their surroundings. They are more expensive than other types of towers because they require additional material to create a "concealed appearance," yet at the same time, they provide less capacity to tenants than other towers do. Below is one of the more interesting concealed towers, located at a church in California.



3. The notification system continues to be clearly broken. Even if you can see, hear, smell and even feel the traffic rumbles from a project you will not be notified. We have to rely on the local paper for belated information if we don't live within the legal MINIMUM for notification. It is hard to submit comments on a proposal ahead of time if you do not know of it. And why are we hiring an Alabama company to notify voters about a project that is supposed to bring jobs to the county like the huge grow? Is your job to do the minimum?

At the Supervisors meeting last week Rex Bohn grumbled that it appeared the huge grow would be another case of appointed Commissioners voting for a proposal (over the wishes of voters -- because they could.) Then, he continued, the Supervisors have to overturn it because they are elected. I had a mental "DUH !" because that is what our system is set up to satisfy...the voters.

But each time we have to overturn your decisions it costs the voters money for the appeal and wastes your time. If you put reasonable conditions on things more people would agree. If you welcomed information being available to residents you would have more success.

Some of us hate the idea of looking at the towers. Some hate the way one person's profit motive can lower property values for everyone nearby. The National Association of Realtors survey said 94% or respondents would have negative views of a property near a cell tower. And if you allow this at 130 feet it will be many more...you know that.

4. This creates a very suspicious electorate always wondering what will happen next. In one decade we fought off Cypress Grove building a 4 acre paved parking

lot and feedlot with a 36 foot high open sided feces compost cube on the 23 acres south of our farm. There was a huge pre Covid style meeting the night before closing on the property and Cypress Grove backed out because residents hated it so much. We managed to get the annexation of our land changed as it was against all our wishes. We still worry about the 2000 more cars each day after Creekside comes in. The proposed roundabouts will flood cars in toward us. And now this spring a giant grow and two towers planned for one little area down our road. Is constant vigilance the answer? I hope not and hope we can trust you to reach out to the public early on these issues.

Thanking you in anticipation,  
Karen Davidson  
1887 Q ST (at Foster )  
Arcata, CA 95521

**From:** [Greg Pargee](#)  
**To:** [Planning Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** New Singular Wireless PCS  
**Date:** Monday, June 28, 2021 5:36:18 PM

---

To whom it may concern,

I am opposed to the Cell Towers being planned in the Bottoms.

I live at 3125 Foster Ave, directly across the street from one of the building sites.

This is a terrible idea, it will look atrocious at 130ft tall, not to mention the health and safety of local residents and children at St Marys and the Charter School!

There has to be a better place to put these... on a ridge and make it look like a redwood tree or out on industrial Samoa.

Thank you,  
Greg Pargee

**From:** [Lisa R Pelletier](#)  
**To:** [Planning Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** NO to cell phone towers  
**Date:** Sunday, June 27, 2021 8:29:12 PM

---

Members of the Planning Commission,

I respectfully request that you deny permits for two (proposed) cell towers on Foster Avenue in the Arcata Bottoms. (New Cingular Wireless PCS, Special Permit and PWM Inc. Conditional Use Permit and Special Permit Record Numbers PLN-2020-16754 and PLN-2021-17005.)

I object to the towers being located within a short distance from schools and neighborhoods (Fuente Nueva Charter School and Coastal Grove Charter School). Please consider the general welfare and safety of persons in the area of the proposed towers, including vulnerable children and elders. We successfully fought these towers in 2003 and it's discouraging to have to go through this all over again.

Please consider: From the recently approved (2017) Humboldt County General Plan re: Communication Facilities. Goal T-G4.

T-G4 Communication Facilities. Orderly planning and appropriate development of communication facilities within the County to achieve reliable access while protecting public health and safety; minimizing visual blight; and preserving the County's rural character including the protection of scenic, natural, and cultural resources.

1) Humboldt County has not yet developed their Communications Ordinance which would identify adequate setbacks for towers from residences, schools, daycare centers and hospitals.

Implementation Measures: T-1 M1 Communications Facilities Ordinance. Adopt a Communications Facilities Ordinance that ensures compatibility of communications facilities with nearby land uses, is proactive in the design and siting of wireless communications facilities, provides incentives for unobtrusive and compatible wireless antennas, and establishes clear standards for such facilities.

2) Evidence of Need for towers has not been adequately demonstrated-General Plan states no need for additional towers in this area.

3) Monitoring and Evaluation of Compliance not identified.

4) Diminished property values-negative impact.

5) No Environmental Analysis or Document-A categorical exemption cannot be used when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place are significant.

Environmental Review: Categorical Exemption, Class 3

6) Conversion of Prime Agricultural soil does not comply with County General Plan and Code (see below):

Conditionally permitted uses that would convert zoned agriculture exclusive or AE zone land to nonagricultural uses shall not be approved unless the Planning Commission makes the following findings:

A. There are no feasible alternatives that would prevent or minimize conversion;

B. The facts support an overriding public interest in the conversion; and

C. For lands outside of designated urban development boundaries, sufficient off-setting mitigation has been provided to prevent a net reduction in the agricultural land base and agricultural production. This requirement shall be known as the "no net loss" agricultural lands policy. "No net loss" mitigation is limited to one (1) or more of the following:

Replanning of vacant agricultural lands from a nonagricultural land use designation to an agricultural plan designation along with the recordation of a permanent conservation easement on this land for continued agricultural use; or

The retirement of nonagricultural uses on lands planned for agriculture and recordation of a permanent conservation easement on this land for continued agricultural use; or

Financial contribution to an agricultural land fund in an amount sufficient to fully offset the agricultural land conversion for those uses enumerated in subsections (C)(1) and (C)(2). The operational details of the land fund, including the process for setting the amount of the financial contribution, shall be established by ordinance.

No consideration of the general welfare and safety of persons in the area of proposed towers.

No alternate sites for towers have been analyzed

Co-location (required as per General Plan) on other towers to fulfill "assumed" need has not been fully analyzed.

Melatonin levels of cows are adversely affected by EMF's causing a reduction in milk production.

In 2003 the Board of Supervisors denied a similar project which was located close to the currently proposed towers following an appeal by the City of Arcata.

No analysis as to how this would affect migratory birds found moving through the area.

No analysis of how this would affect wetlands and biological resources in the area.

I also object to the proposed cell towers as an eyesore on the viewshed. Also, I respectfully request that you require an EIR for this project. The neighbors deserve a full environmental review to ascertain the impacts.

Sincerely,  
Lisa Pelletier  
Arcata, CA

**McClenagan, Laura**

---

**Subject:** FW: Compilation of Research Studies on Cell Tower Radiation and Health - Environmental Health Trust

**From:** Ramona Fair <[msmadrone@gmail.com](mailto:msmadrone@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, June 28, 2021 4:02 PM

**To:** Brian Millar <[brian@landlogistics.com](mailto:brian@landlogistics.com)>

**Subject:** Compilation of Research Studies on Cell Tower Radiation and Health - Environmental Health Trust

Hello Again Brian. This organization & website has a ton of interesting science backed information about cell towers and their health hazards, etc.

'Environmental Health Trust'.

If you could check it out that would be great!

Thank you,  
Ramona Fair

Compilation of Research Studies on Cell Tower Radiation and Health - Environmental Health Trust

<https://ehtrust.org/cell-towers-and-cell-antennae/compilation-of-research-studies-on-cell-tower-radiation-and-health/>